



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

			n 0 + 0 + 0		
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/988,443	11/20/2001	Mark Mittelstaedt	8560		
7:	590 02/18/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
MARK MITTELSTAEDT			THALER, MICHAEL H		
5941 E FORT (	CRITTENOON				
TUCSON, AZ 85750			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3731	2 /	
			DATE MAILED: 02/18/2004	1 2	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					7		
		Applica	ation N .	Applicant(s)			
. /			,443	MITTELSTAEDT, MARK			
Office Action Summary		Examir	ner	Art Unit			
		Michae	l Thaler	3731			
Period fo	- The MAILING DATE of this commun r Reply	ication appears on	the cover sheet with	the correspondence ad	dress		
A SHO THE IN - Exten after 5 - If the - If NO - Failur Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN sions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comr period for reply specified above is less than thirty (5 period for reply is specified above, the maximum st e to reply within the set or extended period for reply sply received by the Office later than three months d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no nunication. 30) days, a reply within the satutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the a	event, however, may a reply statutory minimum of thirty (3 d will expire SIX (6) MONTH application to become ABAN	y be timely filed  30) days will be considered timely S from the mailing date of this co DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	r. Immunication.		
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on					
		2b)⊠ This action is	non-final				
		•		s, prosecution as to the	merits is		
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposiție	on of Claims		•				
		lication					
-	<ul><li>Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.</li><li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li></ul>						
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.	ile withterawn norm	consideration.				
	Claim(s) <u>1</u> is/are rejected.						
-	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
	Claim(s) are subject to restric	ction and/or election	requirement				
	on Papers				•		
	The specification is objected to by the		L)				
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	Applicant may not request that any obje		1				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including						
' '	he oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner.	Note the attached C	Trice Action or form PT	U-152.		
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority  2. Certified copies of the priority  3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation	documents have be documents have be of the priority documental Bureau (PCT R	een received. een received in App ments have been re ule 17.2(a)).	lication No ceived in this National S	Stage		
* S	ee the attached detailed Office actio	n for a list of the ce	rtified copies not red	ceived.			
				•			
Attachment	(s)						
	of References Cited (PTO-892)			mary (PTO-413)			
	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Fation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or			fail Date mal Patent Application (PTO	-152)		
	No(s)/Mail Date	0,00,00,	6) Other:		,		

Art Unit: 3731

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Figures 1 and 2 should be so labeled in the drawings. Figure 2 shows the blades extending longitudinally to different positions such that the blade tips are angled. However figure 1 incorrectly shows the same angle at the blade tips even though it is a front view rather than a side view. Appropriate correction is required.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited. There is no antecedent basis for many terms such as "those blade tips" and "the top plane of the handle". Further, it is unclear exactly what "the top plane of the handle" is.

Art Unit: 3731

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Transue (2001/0034534) in view of Arnold (5,989,273) and Jensen (4,759,363). Transue discloses a multibladed scalpel such that there are many blades 14 in one scalpel. Transue fails to disclose the blade tips oriented such that they define a plane that is at an angle relative to the top of the handle. However, Arnold teaches that the blades of a scalpel should be so oriented in order to accommodate unlevel areas of the skin (col. 8, lines 38-49). It would have been obvious to so arrange the blades of the Transue scalpel so that it too would have this advantage. Transue fails to disclose an adjustable depth gauge. However, Jensen teaches that a scalpel should include an adjustable depth gauge in order to more precisely determine the depth of cut. It would have been obvious to include an adjustable depth gauge with the Transue scalpel so that it too would have this advantage. Transue fails

Art Unit: 3731

to disclose the blades being spaced as close as 0.030 inches. However, Transue, in paragraphs [0003] and [0032], does disclose that the blades can be spaced as close as 0.12 inches (3 mm). Further, it is a well known principle in this art that the dimensions of surgical instruments may be scaled up or down in size to suit the surgeon's and patient's needs. It would have been obvious to space the Transue blades slightly closer together in order to obtain thinner strips of skin for this reason. The spacing between the Jensen blades is inherently varied by a small amount due to imperfections in manufacturing.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Thaler whose telephone number is (703) 308-2981. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael J. Milano can be reached on (703)308-2496. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9306.

Art Unit: 3731

Page 5

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0858.

mht 2/13/04 MICHAEL THALER PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 3731